

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections of the application are respectfully requested in view of the amendments and remarks herewith, which place the application into condition for allowance. The present amendment is being made to facilitate prosecution of the application.

I. STATUS OF THE CLAIMS AND FORMAL MATTERS

Claims 1-9 are currently pending. Claims 1, 8 and 9 are independent. Claims 1, 8 and 9 are hereby amended. No new matter has been introduced. Support for this amendment is provided throughout the Specification as originally filed.

Changes to the claims are not made for the purpose of patentability within the meaning of 35 U.S.C. §101, §102, §103, or §112. Rather, these changes are made simply for clarification and to round out the scope of protection to which Applicants are entitled.

II. REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. §102 and §103

Claims 1 and 7-8 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as allegedly anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,218,668 to Higgins et al. (hereinafter merely "Higgins");

Claim 2 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as allegedly unpatentable over Higgins in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,963,903 to Hon et al. (hereinafter merely "Hon");

Claim 3 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as allegedly unpatentable over Higgins in view of Chiang et al. ("*On Jointly Learning the Parameters in a Character-Synchronous Integrated Speech and Language Model*," 1996) (hereinafter merely "Chiang"); and

Claims 4 and 9 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as allegedly unpatentable over Higgins in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,178, 401 to Franz et al. (hereinafter merely “Franz”).

Claims 5 and 6 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as allegedly unpatentable over Higgins in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,960,447 to Holt et al. (hereinafter merely “Holt”).

Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Independent, as amended, claim 1 is representative and recites, *inter alia*:

“selecting one or more candidate first words from the plurality of input words to be processed by speech recognition processing based on a word score that represents an evaluation of acoustic scores and language scores calculated using said characteristic values, and for selecting one or more candidate second words from the plurality of input words not based on the acoustic score.”

The speech recognition apparatus according to the present invention includes selection means for selecting candidate first words from the input words based on a word score that represents an evaluation of acoustic scores and language scores selecting candidate second words from the plurality of input words not based on the acoustic score. *See, for example*, Publ. App. pars. [0100]-[0101] and [0103]-[0104].

The present invention has the advantage that from a set of words in received speech subjected to processing for speech recognition, one or more first candidate words of the received speech are selected on the basis of a first measure calculated using characteristic values, while one or more candidate second words from the received speech are selected on the basis of a second measure different from the first measure. The scores are calculated on the so selected first and second candidate words from the received speech. Thus, the risk of deterioration in the accuracy in speech recognition is reduced due to non-selection of the second words based on the first measure.

The Office Action points to Higgins col. 4, lines 49-66 and col. 6, lines 16-46 as disclosing the method of speech recognition in which two types of candidates are selected. The Office Action asserts the first type of candidate is selected based on a matching algorithm using a keyword template; the second type of candidate word is selected based on a matching algorithm using a filter template. However, the templates of Higgins do not teach or suggest that the keyword template selects words based on an acoustic score while the second template selects words not based on the acoustic score as recited in claim 1.

Neither the Hon, Chiang, Franz nor Holt references teach or suggest the element missing from Higgins as discussed above. Thus, claims 2-6 and 9 are patentable over those references for at least the same reasons as they are patentable over Higgins.

For reasons similar or somewhat similar to those described above with regard to independent claim 1, independent claims 8 and 9 are also believed to be patentable.

III. DEPENDENT CLAIMS

The other claims are dependent from one of the claims discussed above and are therefore believed patentable for at least the same reasons. Because each dependent claim is also deemed to define an additional aspect of the invention, however, the individual reconsideration of the patentability of each on its own merits is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

Claims 1-9 are in condition for allowance. In the event the Examiner disagrees with any of statements appearing above with respect to the disclosure in the cited reference, or references, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner specifically indicate those portions of the reference, or references, providing the basis for a contrary view.

Please charge any additional fees that may be needed, and credit any overpayment, to our Deposit Account No. 50-0320.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is believed that all of the claims in this application are patentable and Applicants respectfully request early passage to issue of the present application.

Respectfully submitted,

FROMMER LAWRENCE & HAUG LLP
Attorneys for Applicants

By: 

Paul A. Levy
Reg. No. 45,748
(212) 588-0800